

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **1.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Examiner has now rejected claims 1-37 as being unpatentable over Proudler, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,302,585) in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,913) and Moore, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,257,836).<sup>1</sup> The Applicants traverse the rejections.

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method for digitally signing a document, comprising the steps of:

**receiving the document to be digitally signed at a device located at a first location**, wherein the document is one selected from the group consisting of a text document, a contract, a letter and a sales receipt;

**wherein the received document may be displayed in its entirety on said device at the first location**;

generating a representation of the document at said device located at said first location;

forwarding the representation of the document to a personal trusted device, **wherein the representation comprises one selected from the group consisting of document title, document number/id, and author/name id**;

digitally signing **the representation** of the document at the personal trusted device; and,

locating the personal trusted device proximate the first location; and,

**communicating the signing of said representation of said document to said personal computer using a short-range wireless protocol.** [emphasis added]

One of the problems addressed by Applicants' claimed invention is that some personal electronic devices, such as a cell phone, may not be able to fully display a document which a user of such device may wish to sign, such as a contract or sales receipt. To solve that problem, according to the principles of the claimed invention, the document to be signed is displayed **in its entirety** on a first device, such as a personal computer. A representation of that document is generated at the first device and communicated to the personal trusted device; **the representation of the document is not the entire**

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner previously rejected claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-21, 23-27 and 29-37 as being unpatentable over Proudler in view of Wang; and, claims 7, 12, 22 and 28 as being unpatentable over Proudler in view of Wang and Moore.

document, but is of a nature that can be suitably displayed on the personal trusted device. A user of the device can then digitally sign the representation, which is then communicated to the first device over a short-range wireless protocol when the personal trusted device is in proximity to the first device; i.e., the user can simultaneously view the document to be signed on the first device while such user signs the representation of that document on their personal trusted device. That combination of functions is not taught by the cited references, either alone or in combination.

Proudler does teach the display of a document to be signed. Proudler, however, does not teach generating a representation of that document and forwarding it to a personal trusted device. In the prior office action, dated March 17, 2011, it is noted that the Examiner stated that Proudler disclosed performing both the steps of generating the representation of the document and forwarding it to the trusted personal device. In the present office action, *in response to Applicants' prior arguments that Proudler does not teach those claim elements*, the Examiner now acknowledges that "Proudler does not explicitly cite the claimed representation being sent to the trusted component (personal trusted device)." To overcome that acknowledged deficiency in the teachings of Proudler, the Examiner now points to the teachings of Wang, stating that it teaches "how encrypted forms of the data (representations) are sent to [a Portable Electronic Authorization Device (PEAD)]". The teachings of Wang, however, appear to be limited to the approval of a financial transaction, such as in combination with an ATM. Even if the PEAD disclosed by Wang could be used for other than financial transactions, such as the signing of a document, there is no disclosure in Wang to display a document in its entirety on a first device, while simultaneously displaying a representation of such document on a second device, wherein the representation comprises one selected from the group consisting of document title, document number/id, and author/name id. As taught by Wang at column 4, line 41, *et seq.*:

The data pertaining to proposed transaction(s) may then be reviewed by the user, either on a screen 208 of requesting device 202 or optionally on a display screen provided with PEAD 200 (not shown in FIG. 2). If the user approves the transaction, e.g., a purchase of an item for a given amount of money, the user may then signify his approval by activating a switch 210 on PEAD 200, which causes an approval message to be created with the user's identification data, encrypted and transmitted back to requesting device 202 via path 212. If the transaction is not approved, the user may simply do nothing and let the transaction request times out after an elapsed time or may activate another switch on PEAD 200 (not shown in FIG. 1), which causes a reject message, either encrypted or non-encrypted, to be transmitted back to the requesting device 202 via path 212.

As can be seen, "the data pertaining to proposed transaction(s) [can] be reviewed by [a] user [of the PEAD], either on a screen 208 of requesting device 202 or optionally on a display provided [on the PEAD] (not shown in FIG. 2)". Wang **does not** teach displaying a document in its entirety on the screen of a first device and, simultaneously, a representation of the document on a second device. Rather, Wang discloses displaying information on either the screen of a first device or on the display of a second device. Wang is not concerned with the problem addressed by Applicant's invention, wherein a device for electronically signing a document may not have a display sufficient to display a document in its entirety and, thus, only a **representation** of such document is provided to the personal trusted device. The teachings of Wang are only directed to a user approving a transaction using a PEAD and, thus, it makes no distinction between the information to be displayed on either the screen of a first device or on the display of the PEAD.

The Examiner has acknowledged that Proudler fails to teach displaying a representation of a document to be signed on a second device. Wang fails to overcome the deficiency in the teachings of Proudler since it also fails to teach generating a **representation** of a document to be signed, **much less** displaying the document in its entirety on a first device while simultaneously displaying the **representation** of such document on a second device where it can be digitally signed. Accordingly, the

Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 1. Whereas independent claims 18, 27, 30 and 33 recite limitations analogous to those of claim 1, they are also not obvious in view of those references. Furthermore, whereas claims 2-17, 19-26, 28, 29, 31, 32, and 34-37 are dependent from one of those claims, and include the limitations thereof, they are not obvious in view of those references, or further in view of Moore.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Roger S. Burleigh; #40,542/

Roger S. Burleigh  
Registration No. 40,542

Date: November 1, 2011

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799  
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com